

COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XXX. No. 15.] LONDON, SATURDAY, APRIL 13, 1816. [Price 1s. $\frac{1}{2}$ d.

449]

[450

A real remedy! a real remedy!

Rags! Rags! Rags for ever!

Aye, my friends, I told you, that we must have *more paper-money*, or, that *the thing could not go on*. I told you, that the Bank would *not pay in real money*; or, that, if it did, all the landlords and farmers and tradesmen would be utterly ruined, unless the interest of the Debt were diminished. In 1811, while Perceval was yet alive, the Bullion Committee proposed to compel the Bank to pay in real money at the end of two years. Five years have passed, *peace* is come, Napoleon is on our prison-rock, and NOW a bill is brought into parliament to protect the Bank against the demands in cash for TWO YEARS LONGER! Now, John Bull; Big John Bull; Sensible John Bull; Cunning John Bull, what sort of a figure do you think you make in the eyes of the world! You have got Napoleon in your clutches: you have seen Labedoyere and the brave Ney put to death. You have seen the brave Marshal Brune (with whom the Duke of York capitulated at the Helder) murdered by the Royalists, You have seen the Pope, the Bourbons, and the Inquisition restored: but you have *not seen money payments restored at the Bank*. You are a great *Believer*, John; but, I think this new proposition will stagger your faith.—However, this is a matter not to be hurried off one's hands. I intend to have a fair slap at your wise pate next week.

TO THE
PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES OF
AMERICA.

LETTER VIII.

*Prince of Saxe-Cobourg's tooth-ache.—
Poor-rates and Paupers in England.—
In London.—Lincoln Paupers—Prince
Regent's house-keeping.—Schemes for*

lessening poor-rates.—Reduction of salaries.—Despair in many parts.—Repentance for the past.—Proposed taxing of Emigrants.

Botley, 13th April, 1816.

Before I enter upon any other matter, I must inform you that the Prince of SAXE-COBOURG has had a *tooth-ache*, and that, as you will, doubtless, be rejoiced to hear, the pain has been removed, but, unfortunately, not without the pulling out of the tooth. However, it is, as you will see, very gratifying to us to know, that His Serene Highness loses no time in studying our language and laws. The following are the words, in which these facts are communicated to the public.

“From the *Brighton* papers it appears “that Prince LEOPOLD of Cobourg had “been relieved from a painful *tooth-ache* “by the *successful extraction* of the dis- “eased tooth. We understand that the “operation was performed by Mr. BEW, “the skilful dentist of that town.— “Prince Leopold of Cobourg regularly “devotes the early part of the day to “study, and the greatest proportion of “it to *reading*, in order that he may be- “come conversant, *not only* with the “English language, but more particu- “larly its *history, laws, customs, and* “manners.—The Rev. J. S. Clarke ge- “nerally attends his Serene Highness on “these occasions. That Prince Leopold “should *not be diverted* from his present “application is assigned as one *important* “reason for his Serene Highness defer- “ring his introduction at the Drawing- “room to-morrow.”

Now, upon the reading of this para- graph, which I take, mind you, from the Morning Chronicle, which is not what is called a Ministerial print, you will burst out: *****

But, this would be wrong. It would only show, that you know very little about the real state of the public mind in England. Let me hasten, then, to other

P

matters, as to which you will be able to understand me.

Your example may, in many respects, be useful to us; but, in many more, ours may be useful as a warning to you; and, in none more so, than on the subject of *pauperism*, which has increased upon us in a degree, which, at last, threatens to destroy the very roots of the social system in England. In a Letter, which I published on the 15th of November, 1814, addressed to a friend in America, on the Expences, Taxes, &c. of England, compared with those of America, and which Letter, I perceive, has been re-published in your country, I could not, upon the subject of the poor-rates, speak *positively*, there having been no official report made upon the subject, since the year 1803. But, I spoke of them by way of *computation*, the basis of which was the increase of the poor-rates in the parish of *Bishop's Waltham*, with the particulars of which I was but too well acquainted. According to this computation, the poor-rates, I said, of the year when I was writing, would amount, for all England (including Wales), to 7,896,556*l*. I do not perceive, that any doubt of my accuracy, in this respect, has been started. But, *now*, we have fresh *official* accounts before us, made up to March, 1815, that is to say, four months after the date of my computation, or estimate; and, I must confess, that, in laying its contents before you, I do feel some degree of pride. In this official return are not included all the parishes, for want of time, perhaps; so that the return is not quite complete. But, from the following figures, taken from the return itself, you will see how surprizingly near my computation was to the reality.

" In 13,922 Parishes—returned .. L.7,023,386
" In 854 Parishes—not returned ..

The Parishes not returned are principally in populous parts of England. So that the total amount of the rates, if all had been returned, would, I dare say, have been within 100,000*l*. of the computation. However, we have now the fact before us, and a dreadful fact it is. Mr. HOLDSWORTH, whose Letter I insert for publication in America, because the Cossacks should have nothing to gainsay,

estimates the poor-rates as being much higher *now*, than they were last year. I do not, if we speak in *positive* amount; because it requires less to feed people with cheap corn than with dear corn. But, as the positive amount has not been diminished, the *relative* amount has been dreadfully augmented, because the means of support have been greatly *lessened*.

During the war, and what were called days of prosperity, I never could obtain a hearing upon this subject. When Pitt and Rose and Perceval used to be boasting about the prosperity of the country, the flourishing state of the country, the resources of the country, I always bade them look at the increase of the poor-rates and paupers; and asked them, whether a country with so large a part of the people paupers, could be said to be prosperous. *Now*, however, this subject is pressing itself forward with irresistible force. It *now* comes arrayed in all the horrors of misery and all the terrors of desperation. *Millions* of people never yet submitted to be *starved*. Those who raise the food and raiment by their labour must and will have some of it. Laws, coercion, nothing can prevent this. The body, however miserable, will not lie down and die without a struggle.

You have seen before, that many Members of Parliament have *complained* of the amount of the poor-rates. But, of what avail is complaint on such a subject? Any man may as reasonably complain of his great age; for, as it is impossible for any law to make him younger, so is it impossible for any law to diminish the poor-rates, unless by diminishing the number of paupers; and that is only to be done by a *total change of system*, which these gentlemen are very careful never to propose, and which, indeed, they seem always prepared to reprobate. What should we think of a man who *complained* that strong beer made him drunk, and who still continued to drink strong beer by the gallon? Yet, such a man's conduct would be just as consistent as is that of those persons, who complain of the increasing amount of the poor-rates, while they steadily support a system, the unavoidable effect of which is to create paupers.

As to the *extent* of the evil it is not to be described in all its parts. Young and old there can be little short of 2 millions of

paupers in England, including common beggars and persons in hospitals and almshouses; and that is, upon an average, about *one* pauper, or beggar, to every *four* who are not paupers or beggars. I have, upon a former occasion, given particular details of *country* parishes. I will here give an account of the paupers and rates in the Parish of St. SEPULCHRE, which is in the heart of the City of London. I have lying before me an official account, given to me by Mr. MILLER of that Parish, signed by Wm. SCAIFE, vestry clerk, and dated on the 11th of Jan. 1816, which states, that there were then,

Paupers in the Work-house ..	227
Children at Nurse	25
Insane Poor	8
Relieved out of the House	92
Relieved in the Country	9

361

Besides those paupers who receive *occasional relief*.

Now, the number of persons who pay poor-rates in this parish was, at the same period, 612. The *annual* amount of the expences was about 6,600*l*.

This is a pretty picture of the *prosperity* of the *opulent* city of London. Facts like these are food for reflection with sensible men. Such men must see, that it is not an *act of parliament* to make a new arrangement as to the *mode of raising the rates*, which will cure this most dreadful evil. Before the wars against the people of France; before those wars, which have ended in restoring the Bourbons, the Pope, and the Inquisition; before those wars, during which, by way of episode, the Washington Buildings were burnt and Alexandria was plundered; before those wars the paupers in this country were not *one third* part so numerous as they now are. So that here is a change, which the Cossacks should never forget, when they are boasting of the achievements of that "*glorious contest*."

Of the manner, in which the paupers are treated, it would be difficult to give any general description, seeing that it varies very much according to the ability of the people to pay and to the disposition of the persons having power over them. But, what *may* be done with them, and what *is* done, in some cases, may be gathered from the following speech of

SIR ROBERT HERON, made in the House of Commons on the 2nd instant.

"SIR ROBERT HERON moved for leave to bring in a bill, for amending certain clauses in an act recently passed respecting the Lincoln Poor Rates. He was not aware of any good which resulted from particular local Acts respecting poor rates, as he thought the Act of the 22nd George II. was admirably suited to every case. After a painful recital of the miserable state of the workhouse in that city, he mentioned that there were five cells strongly guarded with iron bolts, not for the reception of lunatics, but for the punishment of such poor persons as might fall into any transgression. In each of these there were strong iron staples in the wall and floor, to which the poor delinquent was chained. Among several instances of cruelty, the worthy Baronet mentioned that a Chelsea pensioner, *seventy years of age and totally blind*, had been, for a whole fortnight chained to the floor because he had been drunk! That a very young girl, having contracted a certain disease, had been chained in a similar manner to the floor, lest she should contaminate others. One chain fixed round her body had been weighed, and would the House believe him when he stated, *it was not less than twenty-eight pounds weight!!* These facts he pledged himself were true. therefore, for leave to bring in a Bill for amending the present Act."

I dare say that the Cossacks of Massachusetts will maintain, that all this is very right; or, at any rate, that it is much better that this should take place, than that the French nation should have been suffered to remain free. But, they may be well assured, that this state of things cannot last for *many years*. The number of the paupers is now become so great in proportion to the population of the country, that some serious consequence is at no great distance from us. So that, unless the Cossacks put up prayers for the system, it will fail, at last, as sure as they are born.

However, you in America, must not suppose, that we are *all* paupers; that none of us live in a good style. We are a very liberal people towards our great folks, as I have before shown you. But, that you may have some idea of the way,

in which our Royal Family live, I will here give you an account of the expence of the Prince Regent's *living for a quarter of a year*, as stated in the *Lord Steward's* account up to the 5th of January last. The Lord Steward may be regarded as head servant in the family, who orders in the eatables and drinkables, and pays the in-doorservants and the tradesmen. There are other great men, who manage the *other departments of Expence*. The amount is as follows :

Bread, Butter, Bacon, Cheese and Vegetables.....	£1,121	19	10½
Butcher, Poulterer and Fish-monger.....	3,411	13	11½
Beer and Cider.....	586	9	0
Wax and Tallow Lights.....	1,460	19	7
Grocery, Oilery, Lemons, &c. Tea, Milk and Cream.....	3,235	15	7½
Wine.....	2,120	3	10
Lamps.....	818	6	7½
Washing.....	210	18	0
Fuel.....	1,090	16	0
Stationer.....	96	19	6
Turner and Brazier.....	375	1	0½
China and Glass.....	259	19	3
Linen.....	101	13	3
	14,890	14	8½
Kew Palace.....	0	0	0
Windsor Cottage.....	137	19	0½
Disbursements and Entertainments.....	6,250	0	0
	21,278	12	8½
Her Royal Highness the Princess Charlotte.....	2,614	0	9
Gardens.....	4,575	5	0½
Treasury and Exchequer Fees..	29	10	0
Salaries to Officers and Servants including Wages and Board Wages to Chapels.....	£4,800	3	3
Compensation Allowance in lieu of Tables.....	2,245	9	6
Do..... to retired Officers.....	1,192	10	0
Superannuation Allowance and Bounties to Poor Servants, and Annual Bounty to Widows of deceased Officers and Servants....	4,206	11	3
	12,441	14	0
	£40,942	3	6½

How the Cossacks will smack their lips at the sight of this Bill of Fare! Forty thousand pounds a quarter is 160,000 pounds or 640,000 Dollars a year! Therefore if you think that John Bull is a niggard, you are very much deceived.

Your President receives altogether, only 25,000 Dollars, or, about 6,000*l.* a year; but, then, he is only one of yourselves. He has no Royal blood flowing in his veins. It is not, therefore, proper, that he should be paid as kings and other Royal personages are paid. You see, in this account, the item of wages and board wages to *Chapels*. What would the Cossack Priests give to belong to these chapels! This, I dare say, is one of those "*venerable institutions*" upon which they constantly have their eye. No wonder that they should prefer the British government, "*Monarchy and all.*"

To return, now, to the poor-rates and paupers, I have so many times, proved, as I think, that *pauperism*, that the misery of the labouring people, is a *necessary consequence of heavy taxation*; I have, even in the present Volume, so clearly demonstrated this fact, that I will not here repeat my arguments on the subject. But, a fact or two that I have not recently stated, I will state here. In the reign of Charles II. the poor-rates of England did not amount, in a year, to more than 200,000*l.* And, though the population of England has *increased*, it has not increased in the proportion which is generally supposed, a proof of which is, that hundreds of thousands of acres of land, *formerly cultivated*, now lie in the shape of *Downs*. Near London there has been a great deal of waste land enclosed; but, in Dorsetshire, Wiltshire, Devonshire, Cornwall, and even in Hampshire and Sussex, the old marks of the *plough*, which no time seems capable of effacing, remain on large tracts, where the plough has not gone for a century. London and its neighbourhood have enormously increased in buildings and population; but, whole villages, once populous, in the distant parts of the country, have become depopulated, or, they contain only a few miserable hovels, built of mud and thatch, surrounding a lofty and beautiful old church, built of stone, and of dimensions to contain a thousand people. From these facts, which I defy any one to contradict, I conclude, that nearly all which some parts of the country have gained in population, other parts of it have lost. It is true, that by the vast improvement derived from a knowledge of the arts and sciences, applicable to agriculture, an acre of land has been made to produce, upon an aver

age, more than formerly ; but, then, the waste of luxury has made the demand greater, for the same number of mouths. Therefore, admitting, that, upon the whole, the population of England has increased, it cannot have increased in any very great degree ; but, how fearful has been the increase of the poor-rates and paupers!

Heavy Taxation being the principal cause of this increase, what remedy can be applied other than that of making taxation no longer heavy ? It is useless to bring forward abstract propositions as to the existence and increase of the evil. It is useless to declare, that *something ought to be done*. The only question worth agitating is, *what ought to be done ?* and, the only rational answer to that question is, *render taxation no longer so heavy, that the labourer cannot receive more than a bare sufficiency to sustain life ;* take less from the employer in the shape of taxes, and the labourer and journeyman will then have more in the shape of wages, and will want less, or nothing at all, in the shape of pauper-pay.

There is something so childish in the proposition to make tradesmen and other mere house-holders *assist* the farmers, in the country, in paying the poor-rates ; or, to levy the amount of them by a *general tax*, that I can hardly bring myself to treat it seriously ; just as if every creature who eats *bread*, or, at least, who pays for *bread*, did not *now* assist in reimbursing the farmer for what he pays in poor-rates ! But, there wants a good long essay, one of these days, to show, in a manner more full and clear than I ever yet have shown, that a tax laid upon the land only ; that is to say, for instance, if 50 millions a year were raised in England from the occupiers of land alone, and if there were no other tax in the country, this would be the best, surest, and *fairest* possible mode of raising the 50 millions. This position, which I think myself able to prove to the satisfaction of any man, who will take time to reflect, and whose head is not uncommonly muddy, is a very interesting one to you, in America, who are not yet so far gone in Custom-houses, Excise-offices, and Stamp-offices, as not to be able to stop. As a measure of mere *foreign policy*, it may sometimes be necessary to meet imported goods at the water's edge ; but, the system of a *variety* in taxation, and all the notions

about not taxing *this* or *that* article because such tax *would fall upon the poor ;* the whole of this system and set of notions have arisen piece-meal with the wants of governments, are supported by no one solid principle, and can never stand the test of reason clearly and forcibly applied.

From this radical error, however, what a multitude of mischiefs have arisen ! Amongst a thousand others, we now see before our eyes the mazes in which so many men of good intentions, and good talents, too, are wandering. They first fly on upon this tax, then upon that tax ; one wants relief for the Barley grower, another for those who live on salt meat ; another wants the *little* farmer's riding horse to go untaxed ; a fourth calls for relief for the butter and cheese farmer ; a fifth requests the House to relieve the leather trade ; a sixth calls aloud for the price of beer to be forced down ; a seventh wants a regulation to compel brewers to make their beer of a certain strength ! Why, if these gentleman, some of whom, like Mr. BRAND, for instance, are not only upright but very able men, had not imbibed the false notions of multifarious taxation ; if they could but, for a moment, completely divest themselves of that confusion of ideas, they never would talk thus.

I have been watching narrowly to see whether my LORD FOLKESTONE had his peculiar point of pressure to relieve. No, *he*, at any rate, knows well, that there is but one remedy, and that that is, to lessen the *general load* of taxes ; and, he knows, too, that it is of no consequence where the work is begun or where it is ended, except, indeed, that the *worst tax* always is that, be it on what it may, which employs, in proportion to its amount, the greatest number of tax-gatherers, and gives to the government the greatest degree of undue influence. His Lordship must laugh when he hears the leather and salt tax described as bearing with *peculiar* weight upon the labourer ; for he has a head capable of tracing these taxes to the consumers of bread, meat, cheese, butter, cloth, &c. ; he knows well, that *these* are the persons who finally pay the tax on the leather of the labourer's shoes and on the salt which he puts in his broth.

After all, then, the remedy for *pauperism* is the same as for every other species

of pressure ; that is to say, a *reduction of taxes* ; and, if this reduction take place to any considerable extent, how is the interest of the Debt to be paid ? How are the *grand army* and the *navy* and the *civil list* to be supported ? There is a most furious out-cry for *economy*, on the part of those, who promised to expend their last shilling and the last drop of their blood in the late contest. But, how has economy been begun ? Look at the late divisions, and, you will see, that it has been proposed to take 2,000*l.* a year from Rose's emoluments, but that the proposition has been rejected. You will see, that a similar proposition to get rid of a Secretary of State for the *war department* in time of *peace*, has shared a similar fate. And, I assure you, that I do not expect, that, out of the proposed 29 millions for the peace establishment, *two millions* will be lopped off. *Reason and justice* demand a reduction of all salaries and allowances and pay to the standard of 25 years ago, seeing that *food and wages* are gone back to that standard, and seeing that the salaries, &c. were raised expressly on account of the rise in the price of food and wages. This reduction is so manifestly just and reasonable, and so clearly necessary to the public good, and even to the tranquility of the country, that you will be astonished that the measure should have been delayed for a moment. But (a word in your ear,) there are so many of the *****
 *** who have *****
 that ***** without a reform of parliament.

Yet, 'till this be done, 'till the salaries and pay and civil list be all brought down to the standard of 1792, it would be most atrocious injustice to reduce, or even to talk of reducing, the interest of the debt. It is very true, that at this time, the Stockholders are receiving, in fact, a great deal more than five per centum for money lent since 1797. To bring this matter to a fair state, however, all salaries and pay and allowances must *first* be reduced ; or, how can the parliament attempt to find a justification for reducing the interest of the Debt ? This is the *great obstacle* to a restoration of the nation's affairs ; and, as I have told you before, it is pretty certain, that this obstacle will operate effectually during *this session* of parliament. I do not know,

that the thing will not go on thus, 'till all the present landowners, except the *very great ones*, and except those, who, in some way or other, receive part of the taxes, will have lost their estates, which are now passing away from them at a full gallop ; and, thus, we may, at last, live to see, that the system of Pitt was, in reality, the best and most effectual way of producing *equality*. Every year now gives the aristocracy a furious push downwards. Their estates are continually coming to the hammer. You would be surprised to see how the Commissaries, Contractors, and others, who have grown rich by the war, are shoving them out of their old mansions. You will say, that this is a change for the better ; and, in some respects, it certainly is. At any rate, it is a natural consequence of the measures, which the aristocracy themselves have supported. They are entitled to *no pity*. SIR FRANCIS BURDETT told them, in the House of Commons, years ago, that, "while they were zealously attending to the improvement of the cultivation of the soil ; while they were so active at Agricultural Societies and Cattle-shows, they seemed not to perceive, that the *land itself* had, in fact, been taken from them, and that they would make the sad discovery when it would be too late." These were nearly his very words. The landowners, who heard these words, paid little attention to them. They thought Sir Francis Burdett "a violent man." They now find, that it was *wisdom*, and not *violence*, which dictated this memorable advice.

Since the date of my last letter to you the state of the country has certainly been going on from bad to worse. Despair, in many cases, has made shocking havoc. The sales by distress warrants for rent and taxes have become more and more common. The property at these sales is really *given away*. A plough, which, only a year ago, cost, perhaps, 5 pounds, is sold frequently for 10 or 15 shillings. A threshing machine, which cost *fifty* pounds, was, the other day, not far from my house, sold for *five* pounds. At no great distance a farmer, a fine young man, not married many years, and who had a good fortune, has just *cut his throat*. Two others, within my observation, have gone *mad*. Hundreds quit their farms by *night*,

steal away their goods, and flee the country. I know what *you* will say to all this. I know, that you will say, that you feel for the sufferings of all mankind; but, that you cannot think us more entitled to your compassion, than were the pillaged French people and the brave Marshal Ney and others, whom our allies, the Bourbons, have put to death. I know you will exclaim: *****
 *****. It is all very true. Certainly, if we had not done these things, we should not, at this day, have experienced such miseries as we now experience. These miseries are the natural consequences of such conduct. I must, however, put in this plea for the people of England, that they have been most infamously treated by a *press*, which is not less wicked, and far more powerful, than that of your Cossacks. The people were, perhaps, envious enough of the freedom and happiness of France; but, they never would have acted as they have done, had it not been for a most wicked and powerful press. I know, that you will say, that, when you look back to the scenes at the *River Resin*, at *Frenchtown*, at *Hampton*, and at those which were intended for *Baltimore* and *New Orleans*; and when you reflect that our present miseries arise out of the Debt partly contracted to carry on the war against you, it is impossible for you to cry your eyes out at hearing of these our miseries. And, if I do not ask you to do this, I must, at any rate, beg you to believe, that we have not *all* of us merited this severe visitation of the Pitt system, of which many amongst us have always disapproved.

Lord WELLESLEY has lately observed, in the House of Lords, on the subject of the conduct of *the people*, that they most cheerfully gave their money to carry on the war, and that, "amongst all the Petitions there was not to be found *one word of repentance at our past efforts*." This is stated in the report of the speech; and, if the words were uttered, they were, I dare say, true, as to petitions to the Lords; but, with regard to those, laid before the Commons, there is *repentance* enough expressed for our past efforts, or, at least, for the consequences of them. The petitions of Middlesex, Somersetshire, Worstershire, Wiltshire, and many, many others, express disapprobation at our having interfered in the internal affair

of other nations. LORD HOLLAND is reported to have said, in a recent debate, that, "With regard to the majority of the people who were said to be in favour of the Income Tax, he could not help considering it a majority of the same description as that in favour of the BOURBONS in France, and he suspected that if both majorities were sent where certain individuals had been sent, to *Elba* or *St. Helena*, that either of these islands would be fully large enough to contain them." His Lordship, who is really a very good, and a very able man, has been abused for this by some of our venal writers, but you will not, on that account, pay less attention to his words, which, you may be assured, did not drop from his lips in a casual way, and without solid grounds for believing the fact.

The hired part of the press is continually at work to make the people believe, that the miseries of the country have *not arisen out of the war*. The motive for this is manifest enough. But, they labour in vain. Every man, be he in what state of life he may, knows now, he is now taught by his *feeling*, that it is the taxes which make him suffer. He knows, or is told, of the small amount of taxes that was paid in 1792, and of the plenty and prosperity which then reigned in England. He next asks why the taxes cannot be reduced to the amount of 1792, seeing, that now we are at peace as we were in 1792; and, he is told, that the *cost of the war* renders such reduction impossible. The conclusion is, that the war, and the war alone, has been the cause of his misery; and to prevent him from coming to this conclusion, or to get it out of his head after it is safely lodged there, is beyond the power, even of such a press as ours. The people, therefore, now feel, that they owe their miseries to that war, which they so long supported with all their might. They see, too, that that war has hung a mill-stone about their necks, which is never to be got rid of by any little milk-and-water measures. They appear to feel no interest in any of the projects that are afloat; but, stand in a sort of sulky mood, waiting to see what will be done, or, rather, to see whether any thing *radical* will be done.

One of the schemes that have been started, is, a *tax upon emigration*. I mentioned this in an article, published *last year*,

which letter, I perceive, has been re-published in America. It seemed to me next to impossible, that the project should be seriously entertained, and so I observed, at the time, though I did also say, that I would *answer for nothing* in these times. However, from the following report of what passed, in the House of Lords, upon the subject, on the 5th instant, it would appear that the scheme has, by no means, been abandoned.

" LORD VISCOUNT BULKELEY asked, " whether it was intended to impose any " tax upon persons quitting this country? " He asked this, because he understood " that a number of persons were about to " quit the country, and he thought it a " fair principle that if they *withdrew them-* " *selves from taxation here*, they ought to " be in some way or other made to pay " to the support of the establishments of " the Country.

" THE EARL OF LIVERPOOL said, that " several suggestions had been made upon " this subject to the Treasury, but hither- " to none that he did not consider liable " to too many objections. He thought, " however, the principle *perfectly just*, " that persons who withdrew themselves " from the country, and thus *withdrew* " *themselves from taxation*, should be ren- " dered liable in some way to the support " of the establishments of the Country, if " such a principle could be carried into " effect by means of any plan that would " not draw with it greater disadvantages " than benefit."

These are the speeches for me! They speak volumes. Lords LAUDERDALE and HOLLAND expressed their disapprobation of the scheme; and the latter corrected Lord Liverpool, whom he understood to say, that Emigrants withdrew themselves from *direct* as well as *indirect* taxation. They certainly do not withdraw themselves from the *land tax* nor from the tax on Stamps in part; but, they withdraw themselves from the assessed taxes, and the taxes on consumption, which make more than nineteen twentieths of every man's taxes now that the income tax is gone.

But, only think of its being a matter of importance to *check* English land-owners in *their desire to go and spend their incomes abroad!* That it is truly humiliating to think that any such measure should have been thought of every man must see.

And, what sort of measures must those be, by which such a tax could be apportioned and collected? *Who* is to KNOW whether a gentleman be gone out of the kingdom or not? Lord Liverpool says, that " several suggestions have been made " upon the subject to the Treasury." What a curious thing this collection of suggestions must be! I would give a trifle to get at them. However, suggest as long as they please, I defy them to collect any such tax without first passing a law to prohibit *all* persons whatever going out of the country without a *licence*: and, whenever that shall take place, you will, I hope, no longer deny, that this is indeed, " a nice little, tight little Island."

Lord BULKELEY knows, it seems, of " a number of persons who are about to " quit the country." I dare say his lordship does; and he will know of more yet. But, if a man has no income and no property that he has stolen from the public, why should he not go and spend his income where he pleases? However, the effect of a tax would be to make people *sell* their property and carry the gold and silver to other countries. Those who have entailed estates could not, indeed, do this; but many others would; so that, in a very short time, the remedy would be found to be worse than the disease. Yet, it is very true, that these emigrations will add much to the miseries of the country by leaving so many labourers and servants to become paupers; and to be maintained by those who are compelled to remain at home. The country seats will, many of them, become desolate. Cattle will roam over the lawns and pleasure-grounds; the fruit trees will run to ruin; the bramble and the nettle will become the tenants of the parterre; and the chattering of the Jack-Daws will alone be heard in those halls which used to resound with toasts and songs in praise of the Squire. Alas! poor Squire Jolterhead! What, you are setting off, then, to learn French in your old age? You are going to exchange the " *Roast Beef of Old England*" for the " *Soup maigre, frogs, and sallad of France.*" Well! fare thee well, Jolterhead; and, when thou lookest back with aching heart towards England, recollect, that it is not the Jacobins, but the Pittites, who have driven thee from thy estate.

The following is a specimen of what is



going on in the neighbourhood of *Exeter*. It is taken from an *Exeter* newspaper of last week :—"It is with *much regret* we learn, that *several genteel families* are *shortly about to emigrate from this neighbourhood to France*; among the rest a *Gentleman, who is a magistrate of the county, residing a few miles distant from this city, of considerable landed property*,—so that the annual value of his estates will be laid out with *Frenchmen*. We are sorry that this *unpatriotic custom* is so prevalent—it is a serious and a growing evil; and it is much to be wished that the Legislature would attach some *weighty taxation* on *British capital* thus transferred into the hands of *foreigners*." *Exeter* is the capital of *Devonshire*; a very fine city, and in a very rich and most delightful country. But, how does the author of this paragraph know what are the circumstances of this gentleman? How does he know what debts he may have to pay, and whether his income will maintain him in *England*, after the paying of those debts!

This is, as I, more than two years ago, said it would be, a very serious feature in our situation. It is allowed, on all hands, that the pre-eminent wretchedness of *Ireland* has in a great degree, arisen from the *absence* of the owners of the land. And, of course, the same consequences will follow in *England*. For remain here to help pay the 60 millions of taxes that are wanted those persons will not, who can remove from the country without great inconvenience. The half pay officers (a very numerous class) will carry their pay to *Belgium* and *France* from the same motive, that people of fortune will go thither. People in the middle ranks of life, farmers and tradesmen and artizans and manufacturers, will, many of them, remove; and, indeed, they are now removing to *America*, whether motives of religious and political freedom will also take great numbers. The persons who go to *America* will, too, be from amongst the *best* in this country. They will either be persons who have some property to begin with; or they will be journeymen of the best talents in their several trades. They will all be men of enterprize, full of confidence in their health and abilities.

So that, if the present system were to

last for eight or ten years, *England* would become quite a different country from what it ever has been at any former period. The population would dwindle as well with regard to quality as to quantity; the means of the country, and, consequently, its power, would decline. Commerce and Navigation are always in proportion to *internal* industry and means. The falling off of the commerce in the port of *London* is become notorious. The Custom-House is not the crowded scene that it used to be. So that, if this system of expending 60 millions a year be persevered in for a few years; or, indeed, if taxes to *any thing like that amount* continue to be collected, the next eight or ten years will show the world what a change a thousand millions of Debt are capable of producing in the character and power of a country. There is no tax, no law, no penalty, no corporal punishment, that will prevent men from endeavouring to seek ease and happiness. The little Island is *tightly* enough guarded; but, the interest of a Debt of a thousand, or 12 hundred millions, is too large for men to be bound to pay, together with 20 or 30 millions of other expences yearly.

The likely event is, however, that the evil will, before it be long, produce its own cure. What with the fall in the value of all property; the increase of pauperism; the emigration of persons of fortune; the diminution of industry and production; the poverty of farmers, shopkeepers and tradesmen: what with all these and many other causes, one of two things is likely to happen, in the course of two or three years; that is to say, such a falling off in the taxes as will make it impossible for the government to pay the interest of the Debt, or, *such a mode of collection* as will, ***** And, thus, one way or the other, the evil, I think, must, at no distant day, work its own cure.

Since my last, the storm seems to be gathering about the ears of the *Church*. I have told you before what a sort of body this is. I have told you how *strong* it is. But, really, the Agriculture-distress people do appear to be resolved to make a push at it. They seem to think it more vulnerable than either the *Sinecures*, the *Salaries*, the *Pensions*, or the *Civil List*. Numerous petitions are coming *peppering*

in, like grape-shot, against the Tythes. The reasons stated in these petitions are the curious part of the affair. Now, you shall hear those, which the Devonshire people give: "That in order to preserve the Constitution of the United Empire of Great Britain and Ireland, as well as civil as ecclesiastical, it is necessary that there should be an Established Clergy, learned and independent.—That the functions of the Clergy being limited to the promulgation of the Christian doctrines, the influence which they hold by virtue of the Tythe Laws over the Agriculturalist is incompatible with their Holy Establishment, and prevents an extended cultivation of the Land.—That the Tythe Laws in their operation have been the means of creating inveterate jealousies and disputes between the Clergy and the People, which have been followed by secessions from the National Church, and by schisms and opinions destructive of sound morality."

What precious cant! What barefaced falsehood! What outrageous nonsense! These people would abolish the tythes for the sake of religion! At the end of seven hundred years, they have discovered, that Tythes are incompatible with the duties of priests. However, I beg to be clearly understood, as by no means opposing the object in view. But, I cannot suffer falsehood, nonsense, and cant to pass without animadversion. This is a matter, in which I will take no part. Here are the Yeomanry Cavalry on one side and the Clergy on the other. They most cordially united against the French republicans and the English reformers; and I am quite willing, for my part, to leave them to settle the question of Tythes in their own way.

WM. COBBETT.

IMPRISONMENT OF NAPOLEON AND BANK-RESTRICTION BILL.

On these two subjects some curious things have been said, on the first in the House of Lords and on the second in the House of Commons, on the 8th instant.—I insert the debates here at full length, and beg the reader to attend to every word of them.—They are of infinite importance.—Mind, reader, what I have all along said upon these two subjects!

BONAPARTE DETENTION BILL.

Earl BATHURST moved the second reading of the Bonaparte Safe Custody Bill.

Lord HOLLAND. He did not rise to oppose the Bill; for though he was well aware that he might think there was neither magnanimity nor sound policy in the mode in which we were proceeding with respect to this individual, yet a majority both in Parliament and out of doors were of opinion that some such proceeding was necessary. He had on a former occasion stated the reasons on which his opinion was founded, and would not now repeat them, especially as he would have the opportunity of recording the reasons of his dissent on the journals—a privilege of which he strongly felt the value on this occasion. He was astonished, however, that the Noble Secretary of State should have proposed the second reading of a bill of this sort, without stating the reasons on which it was founded, and even without explanation as to its nature and object. There was one thing to which he could not help calling their Lordships' attention, as connected with this bill—he alluded to the treaty by which Great Britain had become bound to keep him. Napoleon delivered himself up in July last; and soon after a treaty appeared, by which Great Britain, without any stipulation in its favour, had gratuitously offered to guard and keep him. Now he would ask, when we had him in our power to be dealt with according as the law of nations, or the municipal law and policy of this country, might dictate, why it was that Ministers had voluntarily shackled the councils of this country by such a treaty? Because, if we were authorised by the law of nations, and the municipal law of the country, to detain Napoleon, then we had full power to do so without this treaty. If the other Powers considered it as an advantage that he should be so kept, why did we do it gratuitously? Two of these Powers stood in a peculiar situation with respect to Bonaparte. One was nearly connected with him by marriage; and another had not only been connected with him by treaties, but the Sovereign had avowed the strongest personal attachment to him, and that, too, after all those acts for which he had been particularly stigmatized; the murder of

the Duc D'Enghien, and all the other crimes of that description; after the invasion of Spain, the greatest political crime he had ever committed. If, notwithstanding all this, they thought that it was for the safety of Europe that he should be detained as a prisoner of war, why should we so detain him under a treaty with them, without any stipulation for the benefit of this country? The Ministers had him in their own power; and if they were justified in detaining him by the law of nations and of this country, then, when the other Powers called upon them for a treaty to effect that object, they might have insisted upon some benefit in return for their own country. Why, then, did they spontaneously and gratuitously undertake this office, especially when the country was so much overburdened with the immense military establishment which the Ministers were resolved to keep on foot, and when one of them had stated, as the ground of his opinion on that head, that the true statesman-like maxim in these cases was, not to consider the actual danger, but those dangers which by possibility might arise. Was it not possible that the policy of Great Britain might be different from what it was at present? Was it not possible that our political views might be different from those of Russia and Prussia? Why, then, did Ministers conclude a treaty onerous on this country without any equivalent? The treaty began with an allegation that Bonaparte was then in the power of the Allied Sovereigns, which was unfounded in fact, for he was then in the power of Great Britain alone; and it was curious, after this, to find that Great Britain was to be loaded with all the expense and all the responsibility of keeping him, for the gratification of their revenge or ingratitude, and that, too, without compensation. Without any reference to the individual himself, or what might be his deserts, we ought to deal with him in a manner becoming this country. We ought not to consider merely what punishment the individual might be thought to deserve, but what punishment it became a great and liberal nation to inflict. With respect to the Bill itself, he wished the House to consider what it was, and what would be its legal consequences when it passed. In reading the Bill he found great difficulty in understanding the first

of these points. But whether their Lordships approved of the detention or not, it was proper that they should understand clearly and distinctly what they were to do, whether the bill was necessary to give the power of detaining him as a prisoner of war, or whether it was competent to the Ministers legally to detain him as such by the law of nations, and by the municipal law of this country as it now stood. He knew it was generally considered as expedient that he should be so detained, whether it was at present legal or not; but it did not follow that the same provisions were necessary, whether he might be legally detained or not. If he might be legally detained as a prisoner of war, then the bill ought to be declaratory merely, and then such restrictions and other provisions might be added as should appear proper. If it was expedient that he should be kept as a prisoner of war, though that was not at present legal, then it would be necessary to enact, not as this bill did, but, that Napoleon should be considered as a prisoner of war from the time when he delivered himself up, and then there ought to be an indemnity to those who had done what they had no legal authority to do. That sort of indemnity was, in fact, inserted in the St. Helena Intercourse Bill. It would, therefore, be of great use to have the opinion of the Judges, whether Napoleon might, as the law now stood, be detained as a prisoner of war. All he contended for was this, that it was necessary to know what was the actual state of the matter on which they were to legislate. Was Bonaparte a prisoner of war by the law as it at present stood, or was he not? Till they knew this they were legislating in the dark, and it was necessary, therefore, to desire the attendance of the Judges. The Noble Lord (Eldon) might smile, but the Noble Lord knew, that doubts had existed on this head, and it was fitting to know exactly how the matter stood, before they proceeded with a Bill, from which it might be inferred that it was not legal. The first question arose on the words of the Bill, "he shall be held to be and dealt with as a prisoner of war." If then he was to be held and dealt with as a prisoner of war by virtue of this Bill, what would be the legal consequences of such an enactment? He should then propose to submit to the Judges these ques-

tions:—1st, What was the precise description of an alien enemy and an alien friend? 2nd, Whether any person could be considered as an alien enemy, who was not the subject of any state with which we were at war? 3d, Was an alien enemy taken in war entitled to his *Habeas Corpus*, if detained after the signature of a treaty of peace, with all the Powers or any of which he could be considered as a subject? 4th, Could any person be held as a prisoner of war, who was not the subject of any known State? 5th, Could any man be so detained who was the subject of a state with whom we were not at war? The answer to these questions would put their Lordships in possession of the proper information on this subject. If there was no doubt about the law, why was this Bill brought in? He was exposing himself very imprudently to the sort of answer which would be given to all this, namely, that he was an admirer of Bonaparte and the French revolution, and so forth; for all the arguments of the Ministers on all occasions might be comprised under two general heads—Napoleon Bonaparte, and 1806. But leaving them the benefit of these arguments, he returned to the real question—why should they be called upon to pass a law in the dark? With respect to the other point—what would be the legal effect of the bill, perhaps it might be more regular to reserve that for the Committee: But he would now ask any of the Noble and Learned Lords, whether a prisoner of war could bring an action against any of his Majesty's subjects? and if not, whether it was his being in custody, or his being a subject of a State at war with us, that was the cause of it? He understood that a prisoner of war might maintain such an action, unless his adversary pleaded that he was an alien enemy; and the effect of such a plea he understood to be, that the plaintiff's suit was stopped or suspended, but not quashed, because the Court contemplated that the alien enemy might become an alien friend, and then he would be entitled to proceed with his suit. This Bill would render the law absolutely unintelligible on this point. The common law had no provision about modes of proceeding in the case of a prisoner of war, and only contemplated the character of alien friend or alien enemy, and recognised the keep-

ing an alien enemy in custody; and unless they knew precisely what was the state of the law at present, the consequence of passing this Bill would be to involve the matter in legal subtleties, which even the ingenuity of the Noble and Learned Lord could not unravel. He wished, therefore, that the second reading of the Bill should be postponed till after the Holydays, as the Judges who were absent in the discharge of their important duties could not attend till then. This could hardly be objected to on the ground of delay, as the Ministers had the same means of bringing forward such a Bill, if necessary, long ago; and the delay was therefore owing to themselves, and not to those who were desirous of having the proper information on the subject, before they agreed to a Bill of which the consequences might be so important. He moved that the Bill be read a second time the first Tuesday after the recess, and, for that purpose, that the word "now" be left out of the motion for the immediate second reading.

Earl BATHURST said, his not stating the grounds of this measure did not arise from any inattention or disrespect to the House, but because he thought there were no objections to the bill which could properly be made in this stage. Bonaparte had surrendered himself, but that did not make him the less a prisoner of war. No act of his could suspend our right, and he was as much a prisoner of war as if he had been taken in battle. There might be some question, whether, after the treaty of peace, he could be detained as a prisoner of war, and this bill had been brought in to clear all doubt on that question, and to regulate the mode of his detention. The character of a prisoner of war was well known in our statute book, and that, therefore, was the character under which he was to be detained. The Noble Lord had referred to the treaty about his detention, and had adverted to certain questions of policy on that head: but the Noble Lord forgot that we were at that time acting in strict concert with the other Powers; and that when Napoleon was in the power of one, it followed that he must be considered as in the power of all the Allies. We had no exclusive power over Bonaparte, for he had given himself up in consequence of a common effort. As to our undertaking to keep him, it was certainly an advantage to this coun-

try to be allowed to do it, as we must be better satisfied that it would be properly done, than if he had been left in the power of any other. Each had an equal right to demand him for safe custody; and none could keep him with more honour, security, and lenity, than this country. If he had been left in the power of Russia, Austria, Prussia, or France, we might not have been so well satisfied. The Noble Lord said that the policy of these Powers might not be always the same as now. That was true, but might they not say the same thing as to us? Our policy might vary, and therefore it was perfectly reasonable that they should have an obligation on our part, independent of our existing policy. The Noble Lord seemed to consider that the dignity of the House required that we should have precise information how the law stood at present: but he could not see how the dignity of the House was concerned, and under this bill Bonaparte would be treated as a prisoner of war, with such restrictions as might appear proper. As this bill would place him in the situation of a prisoner of war, it did not appear material to have it ascertained how the law actually stood at present as to that point.

Lord HOLLAND observed, in explanation that his argument had been misapprehended. He had no doubt that the other powers might wish to have him detained as a prisoner of war; but why did we consent to do this for them without some advantage to ourselves, they having an equal interest in his detention as we had? Might not the policy of this country change? and why did we come under an obligation to deal with Bonaparte as they wished, without any valuable consideration of particular advantage to ourselves? In order to illustrate his argument, he would put an extreme case, and he admitted that it was such. Suppose such a change in the views of Austria, with respect to France, as that the Austrian Government might be inclined to place the son of Napoleon on the throne of France, and suppose a revolution in France, which would render this an easy matter. Then, suppose we might find it necessary to court the alliance of Austria and France against other Powers of the Continent. The son of Napoleon might insist upon the release of his father as a preliminary condition; and then the in-

convenience would arise from our engagements with Russia and Prussia on this head. Some such change might take place in the policy of the country, not only under other Ministers, but even under the present Ministers; and why were the councils of this country thus shackled without any valuable consideration? Some thought that the detention of Bonaparte was legal; others thought it was not legal, but that it was expedient. Then, in order to know how to legislate correctly, their Lordships ought to know how the law stood at present.

Earl BATHURST.—He had not misunderstood the Noble Lord. He again stated that we had no exclusive right over Napoleon, and that it was reasonable our allies should ask some security for his detention beyond the existing policy of this country; and if it was reasonable in them to ask it, it was proper in us to give it. We would not be satisfied without some such security if they had him.

Lord HOLLAND.—Would they have him without a sum of money?

Earl of LAUDERDALE.—He thought that too much importance had been attached to this matter, and that Ministers seemed to conceive that there was something preternatural in the influence of this man. He might have been kept in this country very securely in the custody of a peace officer, and there were some very active peace officers who would take sufficient care of him; but Bonaparte seemed to have paralysed the senses of the foreign Sovereigns, and also the senses of those who framed this bill. Why did they not speak plainly out, instead of wording it in this obscure phraseology? The preamble was, that whereas Bonaparte was detained at St. Helena, it was expedient that he should still be detained there: the obvious meaning of which was, that the cause of his being further kept there was, that he had been kept there before. This was holding out to our Allies that Bonaparte had never been dangerous till he was confined at St. Helena; whereas they had found by experience that he was dangerous before. The Noble Earl said that it was not necessary to decide whether he was a prisoner of war without this Bill: but he insisted that it was impossible to pass it without deciding that without it he was not a prisoner of war, and had been illegally detained, so that an indem-

tions:—1st, What was the precise description of an alien enemy and an alien friend? 2nd, Whether any person could be considered as an alien enemy, who was not the subject of any state with which we were at war? 3d, Was an alien enemy taken in war entitled to his *Habeas Corpus*, if detained after the signature of a treaty of peace, with all the Powers or any of which he could be considered as a subject? 4th, Could any person be held as a prisoner of war, who was not the subject of any known State? 5th, Could any man be so detained who was the subject of a state with whom we were not at war? The answer to these questions would put their Lordships in possession of the proper information on this subject. If there was no doubt about the law, why was this Bill brought in? He was exposing himself very imprudently to the sort of answer which would be given to all this, namely, that he was an admirer of Bonaparte and the French revolution, and so forth; for all the arguments of the Ministers on all occasions might be comprised under two general heads—Napoleon Bonaparte, and 1806. But leaving them the benefit of these arguments, he returned to the real question—why should they be called upon to pass a law in the dark? With respect to the other point—what would be the legal effect of the bill, perhaps it might be more regular to reserve that for the Committee: But he would now ask any of the Noble and Learned Lords, whether a prisoner of war could bring an action against any of his Majesty's subjects? and if not, whether it was his being in custody, or his being a subject of a State at war with us, that was the cause of it? He understood that a prisoner of war might maintain such an action, unless his adversary pleaded that he was an alien enemy; and the effect of such a plea he understood to be, that the plaintiff's suit was stopped or suspended, but not quashed, because the Court contemplated that the alien enemy might become an alien friend, and then he would be entitled to proceed with his suit. This Bill would render the law absolutely unintelligible on this point. The common law had no provision about modes of proceeding in the case of a prisoner of war, and only contemplated the character of alien friend or alien enemy, and recognised the keep-

ing an alien enemy in custody; and unless they knew precisely what was the state of the law at present, the consequence of passing this Bill would be to involve the matter in legal subtleties, which even the ingenuity of the Noble and Learned Lord could not unravel. He wished, therefore, that the second reading of the Bill should be postponed till after the Holydays, as the Judges who were absent in the discharge of their important duties could not attend till then. This could hardly be objected to on the ground of delay, as the Ministers had the same means of bringing forward such a Bill, if necessary, long ago; and the delay was therefore owing to themselves, and not to those who were desirous of having the proper information on the subject, before they agreed to a Bill of which the consequences might be so important. He moved that the Bill be read a second time the first Tuesday after the recess, and, for that purpose, that the word "now" be left out of the motion for the immediate second reading.

Earl BATHURST said, his not stating the grounds of this measure did not arise from any inattention or disrespect to the House, but because he thought there were no objections to the bill which could properly be made in this stage. Bonaparte had surrendered himself, but that did not make him the less a prisoner of war. No act of his could suspend our right, and he was as much a prisoner of war as if he had been taken in battle. There might be some question, whether, after the treaty of peace, he could be detained as a prisoner of war, and this bill had been brought in to clear all doubt on that question, and to regulate the mode of his detention. The character of a prisoner of war was well known in our statute book, and that, therefore, was the character under which he was to be detained. The Noble Lord had referred to the treaty about his detention, and had adverted to certain questions of policy on that head: but the Noble Lord forgot that we were at that time acting in strict concert with the other Powers; and that when Napoleon was in the power of one, it followed that he must be considered as in the power of all the Allies. We had no exclusive power over Bonaparte, for he had given himself up in consequence of a common effort. As to our undertaking to keep him, it was certainly an advantage to this coun-

try to be allowed to do it, as we must be better satisfied that it would be properly done, than if he had been left in the power of any other. Each had an equal right to demand him for safe custody; and none could keep him with more honour, security, and lenity, than this country. If he had been left in the power of Russia, Austria, Prussia, or France, we might not have been so well satisfied. The Noble Lord said that the policy of these Powers might not be always the same as now. That was true, but might they not say the same thing as to us? Our policy might vary, and therefore it was perfectly reasonable that they should have an obligation on our part, independent of our existing policy. The Noble Lord seemed to consider that the dignity of the House required that we should have precise information how the law stood at present: but he could not see how the dignity of the House was concerned, and under this bill Bonaparte would be treated as a prisoner of war, with such restrictions as might appear proper. As this bill would place him in the situation of a prisoner of war, it did not appear material to have it ascertained how the law actually stood at present as to that point.

Lord HOLLAND observed, in explanation that his argument had been misapprehended. He had no doubt that the other powers might wish to have him detained as a prisoner of war; but why did we consent to do this for them without some advantage to ourselves, they having an equal interest in his detention as we had? Might not the policy of this country change? and why did we come under an obligation to deal with Bonaparte as they wished, without any valuable consideration of particular advantage to ourselves? In order to illustrate his argument, he would put an extreme case, and he admitted that it was such. Suppose such a change in the views of Austria, with respect to France, as that the Austrian Government might be inclined to place the son of Napoleon on the throne of France, and suppose a revolution in France, which would render this an easy matter. Then, suppose we might find it necessary to court the alliance of Austria and France against other Powers of the Continent. The son of Napoleon might insist upon the release of his father as a preliminary condition; and then the in-

convenience would arise from our engagements with Russia and Prussia on this head. Some such change might take place in the policy of the country, not only under other Ministers, but even under the present Ministers; and why were the councils of this country thus shackled without any valuable consideration? Some thought that the detention of Bonaparte was legal; others thought it was not legal, but that it was expedient. Then, in order to know how to legislate correctly, their Lordships ought to know how the law stood at present.

Earl BATHURST.—He had not misunderstood the Noble Lord. He again stated that we had no exclusive right over Napoleon, and that it was reasonable our allies should ask some security for his detention beyond the existing policy of this country; and if it was reasonable in them to ask it, it was proper in us to give it. We would not be satisfied without some such security if they had him.

Lord HOLLAND.—Would they have him without a sum of money?

Earl of LAUDERDALE.—He thought that too much importance had been attached to this matter, and that Ministers seemed to conceive that there was something preternatural in the influence of this man. He might have been kept in this country very securely in the custody of a peace officer, and there were some very active peace officers who would take sufficient care of him; but Bonaparte seemed to have paralysed the senses of the foreign Sovereigns, and also the senses of those who framed this bill. Why did they not speak plainly out, instead of wording it in this obscure phraseology? The preamble was, that whereas Bonaparte was detained at St. Helena, it was expedient that he should still be detained there: the obvious meaning of which was, that the cause of his being further kept there was, that he had been kept there before. This was holding out to our Allies that Bonaparte had never been dangerous till he was confined at St. Helena; whereas they had found by experience that he was dangerous before. The Noble Earl said that it was not necessary to decide whether he was a prisoner of war without this Bill: but he insisted that it was impossible to pass it without deciding that without it he was not a prisoner of war, and had been illegally detained, so that an indem-

nity might be necessary. This proved the necessity for the delay called for by his Noble Friend. The truth was, that Ministers wished to avoid answering the question whether he was or was not a prisoner of war before, and whose subject he was, or whether he was Emperor of Elba, in order that they might by this Bill confine him at St. Helena, not allowing even a corner in Europe to him who once possessed almost the whole of it. They had put in the St. Helena Intercourse Bill an indemnity to the Lords of the Admiralty, and why had they not stuck an indemnity into this Bill also, which would at least as well correspond with the title? He defied the ingenuity even of the Noble Lord on the Woolsack to make sense of this Bill as it at present stood.

The LORD CHANCELLOR.—He laid no claim to the ingenuity ascribed to him by his Noble Friend, for he thought that it required no particular ingenuity to understand the Bill, though a great deal of ingenuity had been employed to misunderstand it. He would not argue with reference to Bonaparte or 1806, though he thought the latter had been as mischievous as the former; but what he said was this, that there was no good reason for consulting the Judges, because, whether they should answer one way or the other, he should still think this Bill necessary. The enacting part was, that he should be kept as a prisoner of war under certain restrictions; the restrictions being for the purpose of allowing all possible lenity consistent with the safe custody of Bonaparte, though perhaps not strictly conformable to the nature of the confinement of a prisoner of war. The nature of the restrictions was settled, and those who might assist him in any attempt to escape were to be liable to the same punishment as those who assisted in the escape of prisoners of war. The bill, therefore, was sufficiently plain and distinct. Really the Noble Lord (alluding, we believe, to the manner in which the Earl of Lauderdale looked at him while speaking) put such a face upon the matter, (*A laugh*) gave such a countenance to it, that he did not know how to withstand it. With respect to the preamble, he must do as they did in the Committee—postpone it. (*A laugh.*)

Lord HOLLAND's motion, that the word 'now' be left out, was negatived; and the

Bill was read a second time, and ordered to be committed to-morrow.

Earl BATHURST then moved the second reading of the St. Helena Intercourse Bill.

The Earl of LAUDERDALE said, that there was nothing in the title which could lead any one to conjecture that there was a clause of indemnity in the bill.

Earl BATHURST.—The Committee was the proper stage for that objection.

The bill was read a second time; to be committed to-morrow.

Lord HOLLAND moved that his questions be put to the Judges. He did it only *pro forma*, that he might lay the ground for recording his dissent.

The question was accordingly put on these questions, and negatived.—Adjourned.

BANK RESTRICTION ACT.

The Order of the Day for a Committee on this Act having been read,

Mr. GRENFELL wished to know from the Chancellor of the Exchequer, at what time he thought the Bank would be able to renew its payments in specie?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, as far as he could at present judge, thought that in two years payments in specie might be resumed.

The House then went into a Committee on the Bank Restriction Act, in which

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER moved, that this Act be further continued for a time to be limited. The time, as he had already said, would be about two years, as it was better to fix a definitive term when it was probable cash payments could positively be renewed. If trade continued in a flourishing state, there would necessarily be a great influx of specie. He concluded by moving a Resolution for the continuance of the Act.

Mr. GRENFELL desired the House to recollect that some time ago the Chancellor of the Exchequer had mentioned the month of July, 1816, as the time when payments in specie were to be resumed. It seemed to him that there could be no more favourable time for resuming payments in specie than now, when the Mint price of Bullion, particularly of Silver, was the same with the market price. He repeated his opinion that the public should participate in the profits derived by the Bank from this Act.

Mr. PEARSONBY also reminded the House

that July, 1816, was the period fixed by the Right. Hon. the Chancellor of the Exchequer as that at which payments in specie should be resumed. Two years hence he expected that the time when this Act was so be dispensed with would be as far distant as now, excepting the time that would intervene between this time and then.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, in answer to the two last Speakers, observed, that since the passing of the existing Act, the renewal of the war had changed the circumstances of the country, that though our foreign commerce was in a most prosperous state, our internal situation was not flourishing, and that a continuation of the measure was thus rendered necessary. With regard to the public participating in any profits, it would, in his opinion, derogate from the honour of Parliament and the public, were he, by proposing any participation with the Bank, to allow it to be inferred, that the country compromised the character of its currency for a pecuniary consideration.

Mr. PONSONBY and Mr. GRENFELL asserted that the renewal of the Restriction was understood to be one of the conditions of the loan of six millions by the Bank.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER and Lord CASTLEREAGH stated, that the renewal of the Act made no part of the bargain with the Bank.

Sir J. NEWPORT.—When he found that it was proposed to continue the restrictions for two years longer, he lost all hope of ever seeing them cease.

Mr. PONSONBY contended that as long as paper was convertible into gold, there was no scarcity of circulating medium. The restrictions had increased the issue of Bank notes, from which had arisen an artificial price and the disappearance of the circulating medium. He considered the present as an attempt to revive that paper currency which had occasioned the distresses of the country.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER maintained that before the restrictions had been imposed, there had been continual complaints of the want of a circulating medium, especially at the close of the American war, and in 1792.

Mr. PONSONBY said, that the complaints to which the Right Hon. Gentleman alluded, were occasioned by the state of the coin and not the want of a circulating medium.

Lord CASTLEREAGH stated, that even in a mixed circulation, there were 32 millions of guineas in 1797. Now that the industry of the country was doubled, a proportionably large circulation of guineas would be necessary, and that would not be effected without sufficient time to allow the gold to flow in. If the Bank were opened too soon, it would be run upon and rendered unable to support that circulation which even at any time was necessary.

Some further conversation followed between Mr. Ponsonby, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Lord Castlereagh, Mr. Grenfell, Lord Folkstone, and Mr. Melish; the latter of whom reminded the House, that it was the Parliament and the country that obliged the Bank to discontinue its cash payments—it was not the Bank that required it.

After a few words from General Thornton, the resolution was agreed to, and a bill ordered accordingly.

STATE OF IRELAND.

The following Speeches in the House of Lords, on the 2nd. instant are valuable, because they contain a description of the miserable State of Ireland, and will enable my readers to judge of the measures, which have, for years, been adopted towards that country.

The Marquis of BUCKINGHAM rose. The motion which he was now to submit to their Lordships was, that they should resolve themselves into a Committee to consider the state of Ireland. He was at some loss to state the particular grounds on which that motion ought to rest, not certainly from want of grounds for it, but because the grounds were so many, and the subject so large and extensive. Amidst the great mass of matter which presented itself, he only distrusted his own powers, not the strength of the cause which he had to plead. The map of Ireland would show the space over which the evil had spread: and the subject of his complaint was the bad government of ages operating on the feelings and interests of millions, and his witnesses were the whole people of Ireland. The case was made up of the grievances of ages operating on every class of the Irish community. His witnesses were the higher orders impoverish-

ed, and the lower orders driven to despair, and to seek the means of subsistence, not from honest industry, but from plunder and rapine. The proof consisted of facts, clear and notorious; and if it were wanted, he had documentary evidence too to show that the government of Ireland had been radically vicious, and had brought the higher orders of poverty and driven the lower orders to rebellion.—The vice of the government was this, that it operated by a spirit of division, by setting one party against another, till at length it had united both against itself. The proposition which he now had to submit was, not to inquire who had been the authors of this system—whether it was the system of this Minister or of that; but the object was to inquire into the whole of the evil, with a view to the proper remedy. No matter for the present purpose who put the worm there, and cherished it till it had grown an enormous serpent, twining round the limbs, obstructing the circulation of the blood, and tainting the air of Ireland: no matter who put the reptile there. The business now was, to pluck it from the breast, and to look at the past only with a view to find the proper remedy for the future. Perhaps time had been already lost in prosecuting this inquiry. Some had thought that a period of war and tumult was not the proper time for such an investigation; but all must agree in this now, when the season of peace had arrived. He had said that the radical defect was in that system of division by which Ireland was governed. If sacrifices were required, they were demanded from one party to support the other: if boons were granted, they were granted to one party at the expense of the other. He did not allude to the government of this minister or that. There were times at which the government of Ireland was conducted in a different spirit; but the instances were too few, and too short, to prevent the baneful effects of the general system, and only served to irritate the people by the contrast. It was not for him to point out the remedy for the evil: it was for the Committee to consider that point. He

might, he believed, rest here; for after the confidence which had been placed in Ministers with respect to Ireland, it was for them to show what was the situation of Ireland, and how it happened that so large a military force was required for Ireland. It was their Lordships' duty to investigate thoroughly the state of that country, with a view to the proper remedy. This inquiry their Lordships owed in justice to Ireland, where they had consented to maintain an armed garrison even in time of peace. They owed it to themselves to show that they did not mean an armed force to form the whole of the elements of the constitution which they intended for Ireland. They owed it to Ireland that she should not be driven to despair, or think herself an outcast from the pale of the Constitution: and yet such must be the sentence which their Lordships would pass on their fellow-subjects in that country, if they resisted inquiry. It was impossible to enter into the discussion of the situation of Ireland, without taking into consideration that prominent topic which went under the name of the Catholic question; though he should not at this time of day, after the repeated discussions which it had undergone, fatigue their Lordships' attention by entering unnecessarily into it: but to the present state of that question he would call the attention of the House, and confident he was, that if their Lordships went into its consideration with a conciliatory spirit, it would be easy to find a remedy. He would lay down this as a general principle—that whatever was done for the relief of the Catholics, should be done by the legislature alone. Whatever inclination he might have to listen to the statements of every portion of the Catholics, he would not submit their complaints to any jurisdiction but that of Parliament. If differences prevailed amongst the Catholics, they might settle them amongst themselves; but it was the business of the Legislature to do impartial justice to all.

(To be Continued.)